

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ALONZO SHAFFER,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	No. 1:22-cv-1221
-v-	)	
	)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
CODY GILMAN, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On March 7, 2023, the Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that this Court grant a motion to dismiss filed by Defendant Michigan State Police (ECF No. 25). The Court will adopt the report and recommendation and will grant the motion to dismiss.

Law enforcement officers arrested Plaintiff Alonzo Shaffer in early December 2022. Plaintiff alleges the officers violated his civil rights during the arrest. Plaintiff filed this lawsuit without the assistance of an attorney (*pro se*) and the Court has granted Plaintiff leave to proceed without paying the filing fee (*in forma pauperis*). Plaintiff identifies one of the defendants as “Doe State Trooper” and provides an address for a building used by the Michigan State Police.

After being served with the complaint, the Michigan State Police filed a motion to dismiss (ECF No. 15). Plaintiff did not file any response. The Magistrate Judge recommends granting the motion because the Michigan State Police, as an arm of the state of Michigan, enjoy sovereign immunity and have not consented to be sued for damages in federal court.

The Magistrate Judge also recommends any official capacity claim against the trooper be dismissed as well.

Plaintiff filed a document titled “Objection to 3/07/2023 R&R” (ECF No. 26). Plaintiff identifies Defendant Doe as Larnell Hill. The rest of the document makes obscure references to Plaintiff’s disability and medical bills. Plaintiff indicates that he will file additional materials. Plaintiff has since filed a document titled “Elements of the Writ of Mandamus” (ECF No. 31), a document demanding that the Court order Defendants to release interim payments for Plaintiff’s medical bills (ECF No. 34), and a motion asking the Court to review a document summarizing traumatic brain injuries (ECF No. 35).

None of the documents filed by Plaintiff address the R&R issued by the Magistrate Judge. After being served with a report and recommendation (R&R) issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam). Plaintiff has not offered specific objections to any finding of fact, conclusion of law, or recommended disposition in the Report and Recommendation.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS**, as its Opinion, the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 25). The Court **GRANTS** the motion to dismiss filed by the Michigan State Police (ECF No. 15). **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: March 22, 2023

/s/ Paul L. Maloney  
Paul L. Maloney  
United States District Judge